

TREE EVALUATION METHOD FOR PRESERVATION ORDERS (TEMPO):

SURVEY DATA SHEET & DECISION GUIDE

Date: 10/01/2019	Surveyor: Leonie Kapadia
------------------	--------------------------

Tree details	TPO Ref: 431	Tree/Group No: 1	Species: Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam).
	Owner (if known): Miss Paula Shaw		
	Location: 47 Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield, S10 2BR		

Part 1: Amenity assessment

a) Condition & suitability for TPO:

Refer to Guidance Note for definitions

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5) Good | Highly suitable |
| 3) Fair | Suitable |
| 1) Poor | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 0) Dead/Dying/Dangerous | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes: 5 – Good. Tree in good overall health, form and vitality with no visible defects.

* Relates to existing context and is intended to apply to severe irremediable defects only

b) Remaining longevity (in years) & suitability for TPO:

Refer to 'Species Guide' section in Guidance Note

- | | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 5) 100+ | Highly suitable |
| 4) 40-100 | Very suitable |
| 2) 20-40 | Suitable |
| 1) 10-20 | Just suitable |
| 0) <10 | Unsuitable |

Score & Notes

2 – 20-40 years is a conservative estimate for this species at its current age, however the urban environment may shorten its longevity.

*Includes trees which are an existing or near future nuisance, including those clearly outgrowing their context, or which are significantly negating the potential of other trees of better quality

c) Relative public visibility & suitability for TPO:

Consider realistic potential for future visibility with changed land use; refer to Guidance Note

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 5) Very large trees, or large trees that are prominent landscape features | Highly suitable |
| 4) Large trees, or medium trees clearly visible to the public | Suitable |
| 3) Medium trees, or larger trees with limited view only | Just suitable |
| 2) Small trees, or larger trees visible only with difficulty | Unlikely to be suitable |
| 1) Young, v. small, or trees not visible to the public, regardless of size | Probably unsuitable |

Score & Notes

4 – Clearly visible on a busy road as well as being visible from Ecclesall Road which is one of the main arterial routes into and out of the city.

d) Other factors

Trees must have accrued 7 or more points (with no zero score) to qualify

- | | |
|--|--|
| 5) Principal components of arboricultural features, or veteran trees | <p>Score & Notes</p> <p>1</p> |
| 4) Members of groups of trees important for their cohesion | |
| 3) Trees with identifiable historic, commemorative or habitat importance | |
| 2) Trees of particularly good form, especially if rare or unusual | |
| 1) Trees with none of the above additional redeeming features | |

Part 2: Expediency assessment

Trees must have accrued 9 or more points to qualify; refer to Guidance Note

- | | |
|--|---|
| 5) Known threat to tree | <p>Score & Notes</p> <p>5 – section 211 notice of felling received</p> |
| 3) Foreseeable threat to tree | |
| 2) Perceived threat to tree | |
| 1) Precautionary only | |
| 0) Tree known to be an actionable nuisance | |

Part 3: Decision guide

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------|
| Any 0 | Do not apply TPO |
| 1-6 | TPO indefensible |
| 7-10 | Does not merit TPO |
| 11-14 | TPO defensible |
| 15+ | Definitely merits TPO |

Add Scores for Total:

17

Decision:

TPO defensible

This page is intentionally left blank